

EVERYONE IS HERE TO DO THE RIGHT THINGS AND FIND A REASONABLE SOLUTION TO FIREARM DEATHS. WE KNOW THAT THE MENTALLY ILL NEED TO BE PROTECTED FROM THEMSELVES AND THAT THE REST OF US NEED TO BE PROTECTED FROM SOME OF THEM. AND TO BE PROTECTED FROM THE CRIMINALS WHO CARE NOTHING ABOUT LAWS. ONE LEVEL OF PROTECTION IS THE RIGHT TO DEFEND ONE'S SELF AND FAMILY. LIKE THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH, THE RIGHT TO PROTECT ONE'S SELF AND FAMILY IS AN INDIVIDUAL RIGHT. A PERSONAL RIGHT, A HUMAN RIGHT. WHETHER YOU CHOOSE EXERCISE THAT RIGHT OR NOT IS YOUR CHOICE, NOT MINE, NOT THE GOVERNMENTS. I'M CONFIDENT, THAT IF THE STATE OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SAID EVERYONE HAS TO HAVE A GUN, THE CRY WOULD BE LOUDER BUT THE SAME - "NO, THAT IS NOT THE GOVERNMENT'S JOB, IT IS THE RIGHT AND CHOICE OF THE INDIVIDUAL." AND YET, SOME FOLKS DON'T REALIZE THAT THEY AND GUNS OWNERS CAN ONLY PROTECT THEIR FAMILIES INSIDE CONNECTICUT. WHY IS IT THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH IS PRACTICED NATIONWIDE, BUT THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHT TO PROTECT YOURSELF IS RESTRICTED TO YOUR OWN STATE. AND IN SOME STATES, ONLY WITHIN YOUR OWN HOME? 2ND A PEOPLE ARE HERE TO PROVIDE SOLUTIONS TO THE SANDY HOOK ATROCITY WHILE ENSURING THAT 100% OF CONNECTICUT CITIZENS SEE NO FURTHER INFRINGEMENT ON AN INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO PROTECT THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

I AGREE THAT BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR LONG ARMS IS A GOOD STEP FORWARD. BUT IT IS AN INSULT TO EVERY CITIZEN OF CT, THAT A SEPARATE LONG ARM PERMIT WILL SOMEHOW KEEP SANDY HOOK FROM HAPPENING AGAIN. I AGREE THAT COMMITTEE BILL 299 ON **INTERDEPARTMENT COMMUNICATION DURING ACTIVE SHOOTER INCIDENTS** IS GOOD. CONSIDER THIS, HOUSE BILL 6162 MAKES THE REASONABLE POINT OF TAKING GUNS OUT OF THE HOUSE INHABITED BY A MENTALLY ILL PERSON. YET HAS NO PROVISION FOR MAKING THAT HOUSEHOLD SAFE BY RELOCATING THE ILL PERSON TO A STATE RUN PROFESSIONALLY STAFFED FACILITY? PROBLEM SOLVED? NOT!

SENATE BILL 1076 IS 50+ PAGES LONG, IT INCLUDES NOT TRUSTING THE FIREARMS DEALERS TO CALL THE FBI FOR THE BACKGROUND CHECK. IT LIMITS EVERYONE'S DEFENSE FIREARMS CHOICES EXCEPT THE CRIMINALS- THEY DON'T CARE - SO THAT PROBLEM IS IGNORED. TAXES AND FEES WILL DENY LOWER INCOME FOLKS THE OPTION OF OWNING A FIREARM - SO MUCH FOR "IF WE SAVE JUST ONE LIFE, WON'T IT BE WORTH IT". FOR SOME, MOST OF THESE BILLS ARE FEEL GOOD LEGISLATION, FOR OTHERS, MOST BILLS ARE DISRESPECTFUL OF THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL, A BLATANT GUN GRAB AND A BREACH OF AN ELECTED OFFICIAL'S OATH OF OFFICE TO SUPPORT & DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION. LEAVING THE QUESTION: WHY WOULD SOME IN GOVERNMENT WANT TO DO THAT?

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, MATT NOWACK 53 HARVARD CT, MIDDLETOWN, CT